

THAT DUAL SUPPER.

G. W. RENCH.

Having waited a long time for some one who has made a special study of the Jewish Passover to show the errors of Brother Brown's position, and no one seeming disposed to do so I submit the following remarks: The readers of the EVANGELIST have doubtless noticed that Brother Brown labored to uphold a *theory* and the *purpose* of the theory was to enable him to reconcile scriptures which he otherwise had not the ability to do. *Theories* may be necessary to enable puny man to reconcile scriptures which he may know but little about, but *theories*, whether it be the *dual meal theory* or any other, are just as liable to lead men from the truth is to it; in fact, much more so. The great Luther was led to reject the book of James because he could not reconcile the statement of Paul, that our salvation is "not of works lest any man should boast," with the statement of James, that "we are saved by works." The scholarship of the world has long since decided that Luther was wrong and not James.

I must confess that my suspicions are always aroused when I read of an attempt to establish a proposition in the way that Brother Brown attempts to establish his—by appealing first of all, to prejudice. When he quotes elder James Quinter as saying, "that Matthew, Mark, Luke and Christ call the meal they ate that night the Passover, and there being no other Passover in existence than the Jewish," he exultingly adds, "Is not that enough to convince any reasonable man?" And then to thicken the smoke of prejudice so that one can scarcely see through it he intimates that if it had not been for this weakness which made Quinter serve the church, right or wrong, he would have been a Progressive! In other words, Brother Brown means to say that elder James Quinter, the greatest man in the Dunkard church, and who was *almost* a Progressive, holds the same views about the Passover as I, P. J. Brown, do therefore, if you don't believe what I say you will "go back" on Quinter! I have only this to say about the position of Quinter: If he believed that Christ and his apostles ate the Jewish Passover the night before Christ's crucifixion, and then preached and wrote all his life against that doctrine, as he did, then James Quinter was a witness as unreliable as ever lived. If Brother Brown wants the position of Quinter, as he gives it, to stand, then he had better invent some *theory* that will reconcile what Quinter believed and what he preached.

But fortunately for the world, neither

Quinter nor Brown is authority on what Christ did the night before he was crucified. Christ and his apostles have told us some things which they did that night and *their word* is accepted as authority. In Luke 22:15, 16, (R. V.) Jesus says "with desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer: *for I say unto you I will not eat it*, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." Jesus says as plain as language can say anything, that he *desired* to eat the Passover (of course, when the proper time came) *but he would not*. In spite of what Jesus says, recorded by the inspired apostle, that he *would not eat it*, Brother Brown says he *did* eat it, and that he can prove it!! No wonder Brother Brown wants Quinter on his side. If I wanted to prove that Jesus was mistaken and that I could prove it, I should call up a greater witness than Quinter, if I could.

But let us notice Brother Brown's array of testimony proving that Christ did eat the regular Jewish Passover. He says, "I have presented ten, straight forward declarations that Christ ordered the preparation of the *Passover* and the result shows in almost every instance that he, and the disciples did on the same evening eat the Passover which they by his directions had prepared" Now, I must deny that these results show any such thing. That Jesus ordered the *Passover to be prepared*, I admit because the Word plainly declares; but that Jesus and his disciples *ate* the Passover or that he or any of them called the meal which they ate the Passover, I deny. Brother Brown's witnesses *do not say* that the meal which Christ ate was the Passover, not one of them. Notice his first proof: "Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the *Passover*?" Matt. 26:17. But does this scripture *prove* that the meal that Christ ate was the Passover? This does not prove that Christ ever took another mouthful. The *only thing* that it proves, is that his disciples asked about *preparing* the Passover for him. Is this a specimen of Brother Brown's fine discriminative powers? If the fact that Jesus and his disciples *talked* about the Passover *proves* that they *ate* it, then the same logic would compel us to say that because Jesus and his apostles *talked* about adultery they *committed* it. Nonsense! I have seen sprinkling, pouring, capwearing, Mormonism, etc., proved by just such methods.

His 2nd. "And he said, go into the city to such a man, and say unto him the Master says, 'My time is at hand. I will keep the Passover at thy house with my disciples.'" 18. But does this prove that the meal that Christ and his disciples ate was the Passover? Matt. says in the 20th

verse "Now when even was come he was sitting *at meat* (NOT THE PASSOVER) with the twelve. He revealed the news to the disciples as he sat at meat that he would not eat the Passover which they had begun to prepare, that he would be in his grave at that time. This scripture *does prove* that he *intended* to keep the Passover but it does not say the meal which he ate *was* the Passover. If I should say that I will keep Thanksgiving day with Brother Brown and have occasion to eat supper with him the day before thanksgiving the fact that I ate supper with him would be no proof that I kept Thanksgiving. His good wife might have been preparing the Thanksgiving dinner when I came—even had the turkey on the stove cooking and yet when we sat down to supper there would be no turkey on the table, that being reserved until the proper time, the next day. This is precisely what the apostles did. They had made some preparations when Jesus and the other apostles came but no scripture says the meal which these apostles and Christ ate was the Passover, knowing that that meal was to be eaten the *next* evening. So his 2nd proof is no proof at all.

His 3rd. "And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them, and they made ready the Passover." *Made ready*—yes, but this does not say they *ate* it.

His 4th. "Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayest eat the Passover." Mark 14:12. This does not prove that Christ ate a meal of any kind, much less the Passover. It simply tells about the *preparation of it*.

His 5th. "Where is the guest chamber where I shall eat the Passover with my disciples?" Mark 14:14. But does this say he ate it? This says he *intended* to eat it, and he, no doubt, would have eaten it had he not been put to death before the time came for him to eat it. When he sits down to the supper—that "last supper," he explains this very thing. See Luke 22:15, 16.

His 6th. "And they made ready the Passover." Mark 14:16. This does not say they *ate* it.

His 7th. "And he sent Peter and John, saying, go and prepare us the Passover, that we may eat it." Luke 22:8. This does not say that *what they ate was the Passover*.

His 8th. "The Master says, 'where is the guest chamber where I shall eat the Passover with my disciples?'" Luke 22:11. This does not say that the meal which he ate was the Passover which he said he *desired to eat but would not*.

His 9th. "And they made ready the Passover." Luke 22:13. But this does not say they *ate* it. A year or two ago a